

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume XX, Issue No. 2

August 2014

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

Warrior Cops on Steroids: How Post-9/11 Hysteria Created a Policing Monster

By Heather Digby Parton

As Radley Balko documented in his 2013 book entitled "Rise of the Warrior Cops: The Militarization of America's Police Forces," the military industrial complex has created a new industry: the police industrial complex. He traces it back to the early 1980s under the freedom- and liberty-loving Ronald Reagan. The Gipper deemed the drug war to be a real war and easily passed the Military Cooperation With Civilian Law Enforcement Act, "which allowed and encouraged the military to give local, state, and federal police access to military bases, research, and equipment." The police got training from the armed forces and the military became involved with intelligence and operations in the drug war. Every president since then, including Obama, has reauthorized the program.

So this really isn't a new thing. But it's been on steroids since 9/11 with the creation of Department of Homeland Security. Since 9/11 the U.S. has been spending vast sums of money to outfit state and local authorities with surveillance and military gear ostensibly to fight the terrorist threat at home. What we have been seeing in Ferguson, Missouri, these past few days is largely a result of that program. Attorney General Eric Holder is reportedly concerned about this deployment of military gear. Where has Holder and every other officeholder who's expressed dismay these last couple of days been? This equipment didn't just materialize on its own. As we've seen, it's mostly been paid for by the federal government. Indeed, in less than a month a group of militarized police

equipment vendors will be gathering for an annual confab called "Urban Shield" ("Critical training for critical time") in Oakland, California. It features dozens of sponsors, from the DHS to such vendors as Armored Mobility Inc.

The DHS disburses about \$3 billion a year for this sort of thing. Add in the loot that's appropriated by police agencies in the war on drugs and you have a massive incentive to turn the streets of Ferguson, Missouri (or Zuccotti Park) into a scene that looks more like the siege of Fallujah. If you build a police state, the police are going to want to use the equipment. In fact, according to Balko, they're commonly using SWAT teams to deliver all search warrants in some jurisdictions now — no matter what the crime.

All this week people were shocked to see police officers dressed up in what one wag called "commando-chic" pointing guns directly at unarmed civilians. They were taken aback when heavily armed officers wearing desert battle fatigues entered a McDonald's to roust the customers and arrest reporters who were sitting quietly charging their laptops. They saw the unmotivated discharge of tear gas and rubber bullets at protesters. They wondered why there were tanks and automatic weapons in our streets. Well, it's a long overdue wake-up call.

Rand Paul, at least, has stepped up ("We Must Demilitarize the Police", *Time*, August 14, 2014): "When you couple this militarization of law enforcement with an erosion of civil liberties and due process that allows the police to become judge and jury—national security letters, no-knock searches, broad general warrants, pre-conviction forfeiture—we begin to have a very serious problem on our hands. Given these developments, it is almost

impossible for many Americans not to feel like their government is targeting them. Given the racial disparities in our criminal justice system, it is impossible for African-Americans not to feel like their government is particularly targeting them."

There's a reason the Pentagon made reporters "embed" with them during the Afghanistan and Iraq campaigns rather than allow them to report on their own. They learned their lesson from Vietnam: control the images lest the American people see the horror in their living rooms. It's why police are often confiscating video shot by citizens. It's why they arrested those reporters in Ferguson. Once you let the American people see the war with all its domineering violence they will question its necessity. The police in Ferguson have been unable to keep the press from showing those pictures of tanks running through the streets to quell unarmed protests over a police shooting of an unarmed teenager. And the American people are questioning it. Finally. Maybe, at the very least, we can agree that enabling our police to adopt the ethos that the people are their enemy might just be a little bit un-American.

-- Salon, 16 August 14

USDA Solicits Ballistic Vests

Solicitation Number: USDAOIGVEST-5-7-14

May 07, 2014 2:24 pm

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of Inspector General, located in Washington, DC and Regional Offices, pursuant to the authority of FAR Part 13, has a requirement for the commercial [sic] acquisition of ballistic [sic] vests, compliant with NIJ 0101.06 for Level IIIA Ballistic Resistance of body armor. Body armor is gender specific, lightweight, trauma plate/pad

(hard or soft), concealable carrier, tactical vest, undergarment (white), identification patches, accessories (6 pouches), body armor carry bag, and professional measurements. NO SOLICITATION DOCUMENT EXISTS [sic]. All responsible and/or interested sources may submit their company name, point of contact, and telephone number. If received timely, shall be considered by the agency for contact.

Comment by AWR Hawkins: On May 15th Breitbart News reported on a Dept. of Agriculture solicitation for "the commercial acquisition of submachine guns" with 30-round magazines.

"Humanitarian Emergency" Does Not Suspend the Constitution on War Powers

By Robert Naiman

President Obama gave a speech Thursday night purporting to justify today's US military strikes in Iraq. Unfortunately, he failed to answer questions related to Congressional war powers under the Constitution and the War Powers Resolution; that is, he failed to clearly explain why his decision to order airstrikes without Congressional authorization is Constitutional.

These questions are crucial because regardless of what you think of the President's current military action Americans who want the US to use military force less frequently are engaged in a "long game" against the Presidency about the Constitutional, legal, and political scope of the President to make unilateral decisions on the use of force in the absence of an attack or imminent threat of attack on the US.

Every time a President is allowed to "cut corners" on the Constitutional question of Congressional war powers, it sets a bad precedent, eroding a key Constitutional speed bump against unnecessary wars. And every a president succeeds in tearing a hole in the Constitutional and democratic fence that the Framers wisely constructed to try to impede the President from launching unnecessary wars, it's the responsibility of people who want choosing war to be as hard as it should be to try to rebuild the fence.

In the case of Libya 2011, the Administration tore a huge hole in the fence. In the case of Syria 2013, Congress substantially repaired and strengthened the fence. Now the Administration is again attacking the

fence. We need to defend the fence now.

The President said: "And just as I consulted Congress on the decisions I made today, we will continue to do so going forward."

That is not what the Constitution and the War Powers Resolution require of the President on the decision to use military force in the absence of an attack or imminent threat of attack on the U.S.: he needs explicit Congressional authorization.

The President said: "In recent days, these terrorists have continued to move across Iraq..."

The fundamental dynamics are *not* days old. They are (at least) weeks old, and I strongly suspect that the Administration delayed this military action until Congress went on recess.

But it's not like recess appointments. There is no provision in the Constitution for a "recess war."

Consider that the "emergency" bombing of Libya in 2011, the "emergency" push to bomb Syria in 2013 and now the "emergency" bombing of Iraq in 2014 have all taken place during Congressional recesses.

What is the probability that three "emergencies" purportedly requiring immediate military action just happened to occur while Congress was on recess?

The House recently passed legislation sponsored by Rep. Jim McGovern requiring that the Administration seek and obtain specific statutory authorization before initiating "sustained combat" in Iraq.

More than 100 Members of the House recently signed a letter led by Barbara Lee (D-CA) and Scott Rigell (R-VA) insisting that the President come to Congress before using military force in Iraq. It said: "As you consider options for U.S. intervention, we write to urge respect for the constitutional requirements for using force abroad. The Constitution vests in Congress the power and responsibility to authorize offensive military action abroad. The use of military force in Iraq is something the Congress should fully debate and authorize."

Administration officials should be asked why they ignored this letter. The establishment media - especially the New York Times and the Washington Post, which strongly influence Washington in terms of agenda-setting - must be pressed to ask Administration officials about the Constitutional and legal justifications for the Administration's current military actions in Iraq and what Constitutional

and legal limits they believe exist for future military actions in Iraq, if any.

-- TruthOut Op-ed 10 August 2014

Gun Control in the Third Reich: Disarming the Jews and "Enemies of the State"

Reviewed by Audrey D. Kline

Stephen P. Halbrook's book, *Gun Control in the Third Reich* offers a compelling and important account of the role of gun prohibition in aiding Hitler's goals of exterminating the Jews and other "enemies of the state." While much of the early gun prohibition was created with supposedly good intent, Halbrook meticulously details how a change in political regime facilitated manipulating gun registration laws and other gun prohibition to be used in inconceivable ways.

Students of history as well as Second Amendment enthusiasts will find this a fascinating book and will find parallels between gun prohibition in pre-Nazi and Nazi Germany, and attempts to prohibit types of gun ownership and implement other forms of gun prohibition in the U.S. today.

While Halbrook points out that a combination of factors led to the Holocaust, many post-WWI activities contributed to Hitler's ability to disarm targeted groups. Ultimately, the prohibitions enacted by the Nazi regime led to their monopoly control of firearms and eliminated the ability of many groups to defend themselves.

In chaotic post-WWI Germany there were no established policies or laws pertaining to firearm ownership. But conflict between extremist groups and the government led to the implementation of gun control laws. However, well-meaning the laws enabled the government to create registries of gun and ammunition ownership, which ultimately fell into the hands of the Nazis. These lists were methodically used to disarm citizens.

When Hitler became chancellor of Germany in January 1933, he used the post-WWI gun control policies to seize arms and eradicate the so-called "enemies of the state".

By March, Hitler had succeeded in passing the "Enabling Law" which gave him the ability to create laws as he wished, with no requirement for consultation. Following this, the confiscation of weapons escalated. Municipal governments were informed that military weapons and ammunition had to be surrendered by the end of March. The Jews were targeted next, with a large raid in East Berlin in April 1933. Jews were not

forbidden to own firearms until 1938, but the raid led to confiscations and arrests. The 1928 Firearms Law was utilized to identify the so-called enemies of the state and subsequently confiscate their weapons, thereby eliminating private ownership of firearms from the majority of society.

The Law for the Reconstruction of the Reich, passed in January 1934, centralized control over police and led to the replacement of the SA (*Sturm Abteilung* or Brownshirts) with the SS. Upon President Hindenburg's death, Hitler assumed the presidency, allowing him to rule by decree. Hitler could now declare laws at will and there was no right of appeal for those arrested.

Confiscated firearms were redistributed to the police and concentration camp guards. With the adoption of the Nürnberg Laws in 1935, Jews lost their citizenship and consequently their civil rights. A new weapons law was drafted in November that opened the door for the stealing of the gun manufacturing company, Simson & Co., on the pretext that the Jewish owners were guilty of fraud.

The complete confiscation of weapons held by Jews was sparked by the 1938 assassination attempt of a German diplomat in Paris, supposedly by a Polish-Jewish teenager. Kristallnacht, The Night of the Broken Glass, came in the following few days. All Jewish weapons (including such things as letter openers) were confiscated. With the Jews disarmed, Hitler's plans could proceed with a defenseless populace. The majority of the non-Jewish German population was stunned by what had transpired but too afraid to protest. The dangers of silent witness are now well known.

Halbrook concludes by noting that less government regulation and a tradition of rejecting tyranny could have led to a different outcome in Germany. Instead, systematic creation and manipulation of firearms registration and regulations, coupled with the decimation of individual citizen's rights, enabled Hitler's dictatorship and the slaughter of millions of innocent Jews and citizens of Nazi-occupied countries, as well as tens of thousands of Germans. It remains for all of us to wonder what might have been had people refused to register their firearms. Indeed, we should all take note and never forget.

Audrey D. Kline, Ph.D., is associate professor of economics at the University of Louisville, College of Business. -- Mises Daily, May 14, 2014

NRA lobbyist links gun control to Holocaust infuriating US Jewish group

Seattle: The Jewish Federation of Greater Seattle has called for the resignation of a National Rifle Association lobbyist who reportedly linked gun control to the Holocaust.

At a news conference Tuesday, President Keith Dvorchik said longtime NRA spokesman Brian Judy should resign for reportedly connecting a ballot initiative designed to reduce gun violence to Nazi policies that led to the Holocaust.

Mr Dvorchik also demanded the national office of the NRA "make clear that it rejects his ignorant and unproductive dialogue."

A report about Mr Judy surfaced on the liberal blog Horsesass.org. An audio clip plays over a still photo of the meeting and purportedly features Mr Judy talking about Jews who support gun control.

The remarks reportedly were made at a gathering in opposition to Initiative 594, a measure that would expand background checks for gun purchases.

In the recording, a speaker references Nick Hanauer, a Seattle entrepreneur who has contributed more than \$US300,000 to a group supporting I-594. Hanauer, who is Jewish, wrote recently in Politico about how his family fled Nazi Germany. The speaker on the recording references Mr Hanauer's piece:

"Now (Hanauer is) funding, he's put half a million dollars, toward this policy, the same policy that led to his family getting run out of Germany by the Nazis. You know, it's staggering to me, it's just, you can't make this stuff up. That these people, it's like any Jewish people I meet who are anti-gun, I think, 'Are you serious? Do you not remember what happened?' And why did that happen? Because they registered guns and then they took them."

"Why did you have to flee to this country in the first place?" the speaker continues. "Hello! Is anybody home here?"

Mr Judy has not returned messages and e-mails requesting a response. A message left for comment at NRA headquarters was not returned.

Mr Dvorchik, in calling for Mr Judy's resignation, said the Jewish Federation of Greater Seattle has a particular interest in the issue: Eight years ago, a disturbed Muslim man, Naveed Haq, forced his way into the

federation's offices with a handgun, killing one employee and wounding five others.

Mr Dvorchik also demanded that the NRA disavow Mr Judy's purported remarks and the "idiotic, simplistic and simply wrong" idea that the systematic persecution of the Jews in Nazi Germany has anything to do with a ballot measure that calls for background checks for gun purchases.

The Nazis confiscated weapons from Jews, along with all of their other property, before forcing them into ghettos or shipping them off to slave-labor and extermination camps.

To question whether the Jews, who lost nearly 6 million people in the ghettos and Nazi death camps, don't "understand history is the most vile rhetorical question that has ever been asked," Mr Dvorchik said.

-- *The Sydney Morning Herald* July 30, 2014

How 3-D Printed Guns Evolved into Serious Weapons in Just One Year

By Andy Greenberg

A burgeoning subculture of 3-D printed gun enthusiasts dreams of the day when a firearm can be downloaded by anyone as easily as a pirated episode of *Game of Thrones*. But the 27-year-old Japanese man arrested last week for allegedly owning illegal 3-D printed firearms did more than simply download and print other enthusiasts' designs.

Among the half-dozen plastic guns seized from Yoshitomo Imura's home in Kawasaki was a revolver designed to fire six .38-caliber bullets—five more than the Liberator printed pistol. In a video posted online, Imura assembles the handgun from plastic 3-D printed pieces, a few metal pins, screws and rubber bands, then test fires it with blanks.

It's been a full year since I watched the radical libertarian group Defense Distributed test fire the Liberator, the first fully printable gun. Digital gunsmiths who saw the potential of that breakthrough have improved upon the Liberator's clunky, single-shot design. Motivated by a mix of libertarianism, gun rights advocacy and open-source experimentation, their innovations include rifles, derringers, multi-round handguns and the components needed to assemble semi-automatic weapons.

Even as the DIY community has refined 3-D printed guns, it's left legislators and regulators in the dust.

Congressional efforts last year to place restrictions on printed, plastic weapons within the renewed Undetectable Firearms Act fell flat. That said, the legality of 3-D printing a gun in the U.S. remains unclear, which explains why most of the gun designers contacted by WIRED declined to comment or wished to do so anonymously.

Defense Distributed printed the first Liberator in May, 2013, using a second-hand refrigerator-sized Stratasys 3-D printer it bought for \$8,000. Later that month, a gun enthusiast in Wisconsin produced a working firearm for far less, using a \$1,725 Lulzbot printer with less than \$25 in plastic. It fired eight .38-caliber bullets without damage.

Two months later came the first fully 3-D printed rifle, built by a Canadian gunsmith identified only as Matthew. The gun, which he calls the Grizzly, fires .22-caliber bullets. A video clip, since pulled from YouTube, shows him hand-firing it 14 times.

The Grizzly, like the Liberator, requires removing the barrel to load a new round after each shot. Another gunsmith who calls himself "Free-D" or "Franco" test-fired a five-shot .22 caliber derringer revolver. Though the tiny revolver isn't entirely 3-D printed—it uses 8mm metal tube inserts in each barrel and several screws—it is the smallest working 3-D printed gun publicly tested.

The blueprint for dozens of firearms, gun parts and even explosives like grenades and mortar rounds, are hosted online by FOSSCAD, the Free Open Source Software & Computer Aided Design.

Most of FOSSCAD's designs haven't been publicly tested, and its loose-knit members are reluctant to reveal their identities. But one anonymous member summed up the group's motivations: "I think you should be able to 3-D print virtually anything you want."

The anonymous FOSSCAD member noted another proven design that may be far more practical—and have far more serious implications—than fully-printed guns: a key part of a semi-automatic weapon called the lower receiver. That part, which comprises most of the body of a gun, is the most regulated element of a firearm. Print a lower receiver, and you can buy the rest of a gun's components off the shelf without an ID or waiting period.

FOSSCAD members have printed and test fired AR-15 lower receivers, including one designed to be the lightest available, another that includes a printed stock and grip, one designed for a Czechoslovakian semi-

automatic pistol called the Skorpion, and another designed for the SKS, a semi-automatic rifle that fires the same ammunition as an AK-47.

Those partially printed semi-automatic weapons are powerful, military-grade firearms, and because their lower receivers were printed, they are largely unregulated. The FOSSCAD member who spoke to WIRED says it's only a matter of time until fully-printed guns are equally durable and deadly.

"Before the Liberator, if you would have asked someone if plastic guns were possible, they would have laughed at you," he says. "They aren't practical, but that doesn't mean they couldn't be. Hence the desire to improve." -- wired.com 05.15.14

New book: *By Tyranny Out of Necessity: The Bastardy of "Martial Law"* by Edwin Vieira Jr.

Too many Americans accept the notion that, should a "national emergency" occur, only "martial law" could maintain "law and order" and secure the continuation of vital public services - and that therefore "martial law" is not only desirable but even inevitable in an era so fraught with threats from "terrorism" and other dangers against which ordinary citizens are hopelessly unprepared to defend themselves. *By Tyranny Out of Necessity: The Bastardy of "Martial Law"* does what the proponents of "martial law" will never do, what "patriot leaders" should have done long ago but avoid doing, and what ordinary Americans need to do as soon as possible: namely, to scrutinize "martial law" with a jaundiced eye, and dissect it piece by piece by asking:

- Exactly what are the salient characteristics of the varieties of "martial law" most relevant to this country today?

- Why is "martial law" to be feared if, as its proponents assert, it is fully consistent with the Constitution? On the other hand, if "martial law" is not consistent with the Constitution, why do public officials promote it, many average Americans seem to welcome it, and self-styled "patriot leaders" say that nothing can be done to stop it from being imposed in the event of a nationwide crisis?

- What, if any, constitutional basis can any form of "martial law" claim - as applied to whom, under what circumstances, and to what degree?

- What is the one and only form of "martial law" fully consistent with the Constitution - which, because of that

consistency, poses no threat to Americans' freedoms?

Perhaps most importantly, why are Americans neither conversant with this form of "martial law", nor prepared to invoke and execute it in times of national emergency?

-- Blurb on Amazon.com's website

Framing the danger of guns as a public health risk will change the debate on gun control

By Danny Franklin

When Georgia Gov. Nathan Deal signed the so-called guns everywhere law, it marked the latest in a string of legislative defeats for gun-control. Since the December 2012 Sandy Hook murders, 20 states have loosened gun laws. Georgia now allows people to carry concealed weapons into bars, churches, schools and airports and prohibits law enforcement from requiring someone to show their gun owner's license.

Since Sandy Hook why did the nation respond by relaxing gun laws?

For progressives, there's an easy answer — the clout of the National Rifle Association. But as a Democratic strategist who looks at the relationship between public opinion and political reality, I fear that this answer has become a comforting story progressives tell ourselves to avoid facing the fact that the country trusts the NRA more than us. Only those legislators supporting stricter gun laws are at risk.

We need to start looking at guns as a public health problem. Until we change how we frame the debate, the landscape for common-sense gun laws will become increasingly hostile.

Consider: In 2000, an ABC News/Washington Post poll found that 51 percent of those surveyed believed having a gun in the house made it a more dangerous place to be, while only 35 percent believed it made a house safer. In a poll of 800 voters I conducted recently, fifty-three percent now believe a gun makes a house safer and 35 percent more dangerous.

It should be noted that the new majority is wrong. A gun is 12 times more likely to be used on a household member than on an intruder. But in politics, perception is often more important than reality. For most Americans, the lesson of Sandy Hook is "the world is dangerous and I need to protect myself."

By connecting gun laws to high-profile tragedies, we remind people that current laws are failing to prevent those tragedies, undermining our own argument.

What would a public health approach look like? First, it would focus on persuading people of the inherent risks of guns by highlighting the more than 600 fatal gun accidents that occur each year.

Second, it would point toward solutions that might appeal to both sides in the debate — such as incentives for gun buyers to choose a weapon designed so it cannot be fired by anyone other than its owner. Positioned as a way to reduce accidents and thefts, this could appeal to responsible gun owners. Opposition puts the NRA in the position of saying people shouldn't be able to choose a gun they believe could keep them and their families safe.

Third, it would focus on successes, not failures. Since 1993, the rate of gun homicides has dropped by a third while the number of nonfatal gun crimes has dropped by 69 percent, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics. On every metric that matters, we are safer from guns today than we were 20 years ago. When it comes to public health, success breeds momentum. Drops in the rate of smoking led to smoke-free bars and higher cigarette taxes, reducing smoking further. By building a narrative of success, progressives can restore confidence in law enforcement and show that new laws can be applied without restricting the rights of responsible gun owners.

It should be noted that none of this is going to change the minds of extremists within the NRA. But that's not necessary. The key is creating a narrative of shared values and meaningful progress. If the NRA opposes that agenda, it will — over time — lose trust, and its followers in Congress will lose elections. Messaging matters in every political issue. On the issue of guns and violence, its importance is measured in lives saved or lives lost. From a messaging perspective, progressives are losing the gun debate. By reframing the debate, it is possible to choose a winning message and make Americans safer.

Danny Franklin is a partner at Benenson Strategy Group, a strategic consulting firm, and a member of its team advising the White House on public opinion and communications.

-- *The Washington Post* May 2, 2014

Boundary Violations – Gun Politics in the Doctor's Office

By Timothy Wheeler, MD

Imagine this scenario: you visit

your doctor for back pain. Your doctor asks if you have firearms in your home. Then he announces that your family would be better off (especially your children) if you had no guns at all in your house. You leave the doctor's office feeling uneasy, wondering what guns have to do with your backache. Does your doctor care about your family's safety? **Or instead, did he use your trust and his authority to advance a political agenda?**

American families may soon find themselves in this scenario. Social activists are taking their war on gun ownership to a new battleground: the doctor's office. The **American Medical Association (AMA)**, **American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP)**, and **American College of Physicians (ACP)** are urging doctors to probe their patients about guns in their homes. They profess concern for patient safety. But their ulterior motive is a political prejudice against guns and gun owners. **And that places their interventions into the area of unethical physician conduct called boundary violations.**

Doctor-patient sex is the most well-known example of a boundary violation. More recent literature recognizes such issues as finances, confidentiality, and gratification of the doctor's needs. Although boundary violations were first addressed in the psychiatry literature, it has become clear that they also occur in general medical practice.

The patient relies heavily on the physician to act only in the patient's interest and not the physician's. **A doctor must put the patient's needs before his own. But a physician reverses the priorities when because of passionate political beliefs he tries to influence his patient against guns.** This physician puts his own need to "do something" about the perceived evil of guns before the needs of his patient. He crosses the line from healer to political activist. Such doctor-on-patient political activism is recognized in Epstein and Simon's Exploitation Index as a boundary violation.

The AAP, ACP, and AMA are members of the Handgun Epidemic Lowering Plan (HELP) Network, based in Chicago. HELP is an advocacy group dedicated to banning guns. Physicians who disagree with HELP's anti-gun agenda are barred from attending HELP's conferences, a policy unthinkable in any scientific organization. HELP's founder and leader Dr. Katherine Christoffel has compared

guns to viruses that must be eradicated. The group's militant advocacy has no place for differing viewpoints on firearms.

In fact, the AAP has adopted its "gun safety instruction" patient materials from the gun-ban lobby Handgun Control, Inc. (HCI). The AAP and HCI's informational wing the Center to Prevent Handgun Violence advise families in their STOP pamphlet, "The safest thing is to not have a gun in your home, especially not a handgun." And a survey of pediatricians showed 76 percent supported a ban on handguns. Patients who seek objective advice on firearm safety should not look to pediatricians as a group. **And any doctor should know that patient counseling based on these materials is politics, not medicine.**

Perhaps the most revealing aspect of organized medicine's anti-gun bias is its persistent refusal to address the criminology literature on guns. For over 20 years and especially in the last two years researchers have found that firearm ownership is not the scourge that medical activists have claimed it to be. **The best and latest research finds that private gun ownership by responsible citizens not only is safe, but protects the individual as well as his community from violent crime** (Lott J. *More Guns, Less Crime: Understanding Crime and Gun Control Laws*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1998).

One would think that medical firearm researchers would be intensely interested in this scholarship. But so far the editorial boards of the journals of the AAP, AMA, and ACP have neither responded to nor acknowledged it. With their silence these editors have effectively ended whatever credibility they had in firearm research. Such conduct is inexcusable in any area of scientific endeavor. Honest scientists face conflicting data objectively. And honest doctors do not use biased research to give false authority to their negative feelings about guns.

Patients do have remedies for the boundary-crossing doctor. **Changing doctors is the simplest solution. A written complaint to the health plan's membership services department can send a powerful message that boundary violations by doctors will not be tolerated.** If the problem persists, patients can file a complaint with the doctor's state licensing board. Medical licensing boards are increasingly aware of the

In the beginning of change the patriot is a scarce man, brave, hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, however, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot. — Mark Twain

problem of boundary violations.

The author cannot advise the reader to take a particular course of action. A patient confronted with physician misconduct must decide for himself which action, if any, to take. But patients should realize they do have choices in dealing with physician boundary violations involving political activism, especially in such personal matters as firearm ownership. And physicians should be aware of the personal risks they take when they bring political activism into the exam room.

Dr. Wheeler is the Director of Doctors for Responsible Gun Ownership, a Project of The Claremont Institute. His address is P.O. Box 1931, Upland, CA 91785, e-mail: drgotwww@aol.com.

Originally published in the Medical Sentinel (1999;4(2):60) of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons (AAPS).

Gun owner unarmed, unwelcome in Maryland

Yesterday we spotted a story [from the Jan. 14, 2014 Tampa Tribune] about a Florida family driving through Maryland and mysteriously being targeted for a police stop.

They were questioned about owning a gun, their car contents emptied and after approximately 90 minutes they were released.

Obviously for the driver, John Filippidis, and his family, this was alarming. What would prompt the Maryland Transportation Authority Police (MTAP) to stop them?

Because the first question to Mr. Filippidis was about his gun ownership, his Florida CCW permit was most likely the impetus for the stop. [His firearm was locked in a safe in Florida.]

We immediately contacted MTAP and filed public records requests to research what took place.

As it turns out Maryland has databases which access the databases of all other states who coordinate with them. For states who do not comply, or do not align technically, Maryland mines data from various LEO systems.

The intelligence hub which contains this data, is called Maryland

Coordination and Analysis Center. MCAC has access to Florida's CCW list and vehicle plate numbers of CCW holders, and is connected to some 330 ALPRs (Automatic License Plate Reader).

Every time one of the flagged license plates are detected by the ALPR an alert is generated.

Mr. Filippidis license plate was picked up at the Fort McHenry Tunnel on I-95.

A patrol car came abreast of Filippidi in order to visually confirm his ID from his driver's license photo which was on the officers on board computer screen.

The rest is outlined in the article.

[...] Finally the patrol car's emergency lights come on, and it's almost a relief. Whatever was going on, they'd be able to get it over with now. The officer — from the Transportation Authority Police, as it turns out, Maryland's version of the New York-New Jersey Port Authority — strolls up, does the license and registration bit, and returns to his car.... Ten minutes later he's back, and he wants John out of the Expedition. Retreating to the space between the SUV and the unmarked car, the officer orders John to hook his thumbs behind his back and spread his feet. "You own a gun," the officer says. "Where is it?"

Thanks to the multiple sources who contributed to our understanding. In addition to the prior public records requests - we will also be seeking: internal memos, directives, or other printed matter related to out of state CCW holders traveling through ALPR system installations.

-- theconservativetreehouse.com
2014/01/16

First Amendment protects Second in Arizona court victory

By Dave Workman

The Arizona State Court of Appeals ruled late yesterday that the City of Phoenix erred when it prohibited a prominent gun rights advocate from placing "Guns Save Lives" messages

at city bus shelters.

But it may be a narrow win. The Phoenix New Times noted that it "stops well short of forcing the city to accept every ad submitted by the public."

Alan Korwin's attempt to buy advertising at the bus shelters was rejected because the city contended it contained political messaging. The city argued that small print at the center of the advertisement contained what an assistant city attorney called a "diatribe" about the Second Amendment and Arizona gun laws.

Korwin operates TrainMeAZ, a company that promotes firearms education.

The court noted that, "Although Appellant's advertisement clearly contains a number of noncommercial statements, it comports with the first provision of the 2011 Standards requiring that it propose a commercial transaction."

The lawsuit was handled by the Goldwater Institute.

The city has until June 9 to appeal.

"The attempt to suppress the message that guns save lives should give Mayor Bloomberg and his \$50 million campaign to deny our rights one huge festering ulcer," Korwin remarked. "The First Amendment protects the Second Amendment, and here it is on a platter."

-- www.examiner.com May 14, 2014

Chicago gets chilling Islamist State terror tweet: "We are in your streets"

Sunni radicals with the Islamic State terrorist group have posted a number of tweets aimed at the citizens of Chicago, including a picture of a man on Michigan Ave. holding a paper with a hand-written Arabic message: "We are in your streets."

The location of the tweet was 307 N. Michigan Avenue at the city's Old Republic Building, Chicago's WGN network reported Friday.

-- www.washingtontimes.com
2014/Aug. 24

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

www.njmilitia.org

info@njmilitia.org

walnor@keepandbeararms.com

Middlesex County, Art (732) 607-0833

Morris County, Bill (973) 361-3241

Johnson County, TX, Earl (817) 783-2375

Wake County, NC, Dave (919) 295-4008

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State ____ Zip _____